

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08428 271652Z

42

ACTION NODS-00

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /001 W

----- 102848

O 271606Z OCT 76

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3135

S E C R E T GENEVA 8428

NODIS

FOR SCHAUFLE FROM WISNER

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS PFOR RH

SUBJ: RHODESIAN CONFERENCE: DISCUSSION WITH SMITH

REF: STATE 264172

1. IAN SMITH, ACCOMPANIED ONLY BY HIS PRIVATE SECRETARY, RECEIVED ME AT 12:30 LOCAL TIME AND READ SLOWLY AND CAREFULLY THE WRITTEN MESSAGE WHICH I DELIVERED. HE TOOK IMMEDIATE ISSUE WITH THE SENTENCE WHICH READS "SUBSEQUENTLY AFTER CONSULTATIONS WITH THE UK AND THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS, YOU WERE INFORMED THAT THESE TWO ISSUES WOULD BE DIFFICULT BUT PERHAPS MANAGEABLE AND COULD BE INCLUDED AS MODIFICATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL FIVE POINTS."

2. WHILE HE DID NOT WANT TO PICK A FIGHT WITH THE UNITED STATES, SMITH ARGUED FORCEFULLY AND RETURNED TO THE POINT FREQUENTLY DURING OUR MEETING THAT THE MESSAGE OF ASSURANCE HE HAD RECEIVED THROUGH OUR AMBASSADOR AND HIS REPRESENTATIVE IN PRETORIA WAS QUITE CATEGORICAL AND DID NOT HAVE THE SAME MEANING. WITHOUT OUR MESSAGE OF ASSURANCE THAT THE AFRICANS HAD ACCEPTED THE FIVE POINTS, HE WOULD NOT HAVE ATTEMPTED TO SELL HIS ACCEPTANCE TO THE CABINET OR HIS PEOPLE. DURING THE CONVERSATION HE REPEATED

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08428 271652Z

SEVERAL TIMES THAT THIS EXERCISE WOULD NEVER HAVE

BEGUN WITHOUT SECRETARY KISSINGER'S ASSURANCES AS  
CONTAINED IN THE MESSAGE FROM PRETORIA.

3. SMITH SAID THAT HE HAD THE MESSAGE WITH HIM IN  
GENEVA AND COULD "SUBSTANTIATE" HIS POINT IF NECESSARY.  
HE DID NOT SAY OR GIVE THE IMPRESSION THAT HE PLANNED  
TO TAKE THE EXTREME STEP OF MAKING IT PUBLIC.  
(JHON SNELL TOLD ME AFTER THE MEETING HE WANTED TO  
SEND TO ME THE TEXT OF THE MESSAGE AS SMITH RECEIVED  
IT FROM PRETORIA). SMITH STATED THAT "WE MUST TRY  
TO CLEAR THIS UP" AND THAT HE WOULD BE MOST UPSET IF  
IT WERE THOUGHT THAT HE HAD MISREPRESENTED DR. KISSINGER.

4. I THEN ASKED SMITH'S PERMISSION TO COMPLETE MY  
ORAL INSTRUCTIONS WHICH HE ACCEPTED CALMLY AND  
STONEFACED. HE REGRETTED THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION  
OF ANNEX C BUT FELT HE HAD BEEN DRIVEN TO MENTION IT  
BECAUSE RICHARD HAD REFERRED TO ANNEX C SO FREQUENTLY  
IN HIS MEETING OF OCT 23 AND HAD MADE CLEAR TO SMITH  
THAT HE REGARDED IT AND NOT THE FIVE POINTS AS THE  
DOCUMENT UNDER NEGOTIATIONS. SMITH SAID THAT IN THEIR  
FIRST MEETING RICHARD "HAD ALMOST POOH-POOHED THE  
FIVE POINTS" AND HAD SAID "WE ARE WORKING TO ANNEX C".  
BY THE SECOND MEETING, SMITH SAID RICHARD HAD "CHANGED  
HIS TUNE" SOMEWHAT AND HAD SAID THAT THE BRITISH WOULD  
TRY TO WORK WITH THE "FIVE PRINCIPLES". HE HAD ALSO  
BEEN FORCED TO MENTION ANNEX C BECAUSE HE UNDERSTOOD FROM  
HIS PRESS OFFICERS THAT THE BRITISH HAD LEAKED THE FACT  
OF ITS EXISTENCE TO THE PRESS. HIS DELEGATION HAD  
RECEIVED INQUIRIES FROM REPORTERS WHO SAID THE BRITISH  
HAD DONE SO. IN SHORT HE HAD BEEN FORCED INTO HIS  
POSITION BY THE "ANTICS OF THE BRITISH."

5. SMITH'S DEFENSE WAS NOT LOGICAL. I TOLD HIM THAT  
THE FIRST WE HAD HEARD ABOUT THE PRESS INTEREST  
IN ANNEX C WAS AFTER HIS PRESS CONFERENCE. I ALSO  
TOLD HIM THAT WHILE I COULD NOT SPEAK FOR THE BRITISH  
I UNDERSTOOD THE BRITISH WERE GIVING THE FIVE POINTS A  
HARD RUN WITH THE AFRICANS AND WOULD WISH AT AN  
APPROPRIATE TIME IN THE NEGOTIATIONS TO WORK FOR THE BEST  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 08428 271652Z

OUTCOME POSSIBLE DRAWING FROM EVERYTHING AVAILABLE IN-  
CLUDING ANNEX C. I REITERATED THAT WE VIEW THE DIFFERENCE  
BETWEEN THE TWO DOCUMENTS AS HIS MARGIN OF SAFETY  
WHICH HE MUST DO ALL NECESSARY TO DEFEND.

6. HIS ONLY OTHER COMMENT ON THE INSTRUCTED ORAL  
POINTS WAS HIS DEFENSE OF HIS SPEAKING OUT IN PUBLIC  
AND TO THE PRESS. HE HAD TO REASSURE HIS PEOPLE ON

THE ISSUES OF THE CONFERENCE. HE LAID GREAT EMPHASIS ON THE NEED TO NOT LOSE HIS SUPPORT AT HOME. IF THE PEOPLE FEEL HE HAD LIED TO THEM, HE'D BE LAUGHED OUT OF OFFICE. "IF I DON'T REPLY WHEN THE BRITISH CLAIM I MISREPRESENT THE UNDERSTANDINGS, THEN I HAD BETTER GET OUT OF MY PRESENT JOB." IF WHILE RHODESIANS BECOME UPSET, "WE WILL LOSE THEM". "OUR LIVES ARE AT STAKE; WE MUST BE CAREFUL." I TOLD SMITH WE DID NOT QUESTION LEGITIMATE SELF-DEFENSE BUT SAW NO REASON IN HIS DISCUSSING DETAILED NEGOTIATING POSITIONS AND ISSUES IN PUBLIC. I URGED SPECIFICALLY TO MAKE NO FURTHER REFERENCE TO ANNEX C.

7. SMITH RETURNED TO THE CATEGORICAL NATURE OF THE SECRETARY'S ASSURANCES WHICH HE DESCRIBED AS A "FIRM CONTRACT" AND SAID ONLY OUR WORD HAD CONVINCED THE RHODESIAN PEOPLE THAT THE PRESIDENTS WOULD STAND BY THE AGREEMENT AS THEY PROMISED. HE SAID "I COULD ONLY CONVINCE MY COLLEAGUES BY ASSURING THEM OF DR. KISSINGER'S PRESTIGE AND POWER AND THE POWER OF THE UNITED STATES AS THE GREATEST NATION." I TOLD SMITH, AS A PERSONAL OBSERVATION, THAT AS A MAN WITH LONG AFRICAN NEGOTIATING EXPERIENCE HE MUST ACCEPT THE FACT THAT THE FIVE POINTS ARE A POLITICAL AND NOT A LEGAL DOCUMENT. HE SAID HE APPRECIATED THIS POINT BUT FEARED THE NEGOTIATIONS WERE HEADING FOR THE SAME FATE AS THOSE WHICH TOOK PLACE AT VICTORIA FALLS WHERE THE AFRICAN NATIONALISTS WENT BACK ON "CATEGORICAL" AGREEMENTS THAT HAD BEEN REACHED BETWEEN VORSTER AND THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS. HE SAID "I HOPE I AM WRONG BUT WE MAY BE HEADING IN THAT DIRECTION." I URGED STEADINESS AND REPEATED THE SECRETARY'S APPRECIATION FOR HIS DIFFICULT POSITION AND OUR WILLINGNESS TO  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 GENEVA 08428 271652Z

WORK WITH HIM. SMITH RECIPROCATED AND URGED I TRANSMIT HIS SINCERE REGRETS FOR THE MISUNDERSTANDINGS.

9. SMITH WAS OFF BALANCE AND DEFENSIVE THROUGHOUT THE MEETING. HIS JUSTIFICATION FOR MENTIONING ANNEX C WAS NOT CONVINCING.CATTO

SECRET

NNN



## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLITICAL SETTLEMENT, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, POLITICAL SITUATION, CAT-C  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 27 OCT 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** saccheem  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976GENEVA08428  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** P840099-0561, N760007-0805  
**From:** GENEVA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t19761015/aaaaampb.tel  
**Line Count:** 160  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION NODS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** NODIS  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** NODIS  
**Reference:** 76 STATE 264172  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** saccheem  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 11 MAY 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <11 MAY 2004 by greeneet>; APPROVED <20 SEP 2004 by saccheem>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** RODESIAN CONFERENCE: DISCUSSION WITH SMITH  
**TAGS:** PFOR, PNAT, RH, US, (SMITH, IAN)  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006